

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-16 are currently pending of which claim 1 is independent. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the application through this Reply. Applicants appreciate that the previous arguments filed on June 21, 2007 were found persuasive. However, claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9, and 14 now stand rejected under a new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants appreciate that claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10-13, 15, and 16 are indicated to define allowable subject matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTION – Murakami

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Murakami et al. (U.S. 2003/0024845)[hereinafter "Murakami"]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. *See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02.* Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Murakami fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a drive control unit for pivoting the pivotable polarizer with respect to the light axis, wherein the pivotable polarizer adjusts the intensity of a polarization component according to a pivotal angle." *Emphasis added.* Note that the above-identified claim feature has been incorporated from allowable claim 15 with some

modification. Particularly, amended claim 1 recites, “a polarization component” instead of “a S-polarization component” or “P-polarization component”. It is respectfully submitted that Murakami fails to teach or suggest the above-identified claim feature of claim 1.

Indeed, the Examiner acknowledges that Murakami fails to teach or suggest “a drive control unit for pivoting the pivotable polarizer with respect to the light axis, wherein the pivotable polarizer adjusts the intensity of S-polarization component or P-polarization component according to a pivotal angle.” (*See page 5, lines 11-14 of the Office Action.*) Although claim 1 does not specifically claim “intensity of S-polarization component or P-polarization component” as recited in claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Murakami does not teach “a drive control unit” or “the pivotable polarizer” as claimed in claim 1. Murakami merely teaches conventional controlling unit to control an alignment of the liquid crystal molecules in accordance with the applied voltage, whereby the rotation of the polarization axis of each of the incident color light is controlled in order to modulate the color light components. Murakami clearly discloses that the basic structure and the driving method of this type of liquid crystal panel is similar to the structure and the driving method of the conventionally known active matrix type liquid crystal panel. (*See page 5, paragraph [0048].*) Murakami is completely silent on whether there is a drive control unit for pivoting the pivotable polarizer with respect to the light axis, and wherein the pivotable polarizer adjusts the intensity of a polarization component according to a pivotal angle as claimed in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is distinguishable from Murakami. Claims 2, 5, 9, and 14 depend from claim 1, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, claims 2, 5, 9, and 14 are also distinguishable over Murakami.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 9, and 14, based on Murakami, be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION – Murakami, Liang

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Liang et al. (US 2003/0206337) ("Liang"). Claim 7 also depends from claim 1. As demonstrated above, Murakami fails to teach or suggest, "a drive control unit for pivoting the pivotable polarizer with *respect to the light axis*, wherein the *pivotable polarizer adjusts the intensity of a polarization component according to a pivotal angle*" as recited in claim 1. Liang has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct at least this deficiency of Murakami. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion


In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #58,755
D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant